Existence Is Infinite (2025)

Silenus Kallikantzaros — daniel j lavender — 6d

> daniel_j_lavender:
>
> The abstraction, the thing, on any level, *is*. It is perceived or interacted with, at least in part. That indicates a thing, that indicates existence, by definition.

The patterns are…the thing is a representation. An abstraction.

All exists…even the representation of the energy pattern is itself an energy pattern.

ALL is energy.

> daniel_j_lavender:
>
> hat you're saying is incomprehensible because you lack a coherent, structured ontology.

That's YOUR opinion because you lack IQ.

You need a thing…this is what you call Ontolgy

> daniel_j_lavender:
>
> But changing at such a rate we still perceive it as an individual thing. That is what counts, in this sense.

Yes…that's how it becomes useful to life….but it is still a representation of an energy pattern

> daniel_j_lavender:
>
> The study of being or existence. Or a system of it.
>
> The philosophy presented here is a foundational ontology.

And I am presenting my own.

I haven't explained it all, nor do I care to…and you certainly are incapable of understanding it…so why waste my time?

Ontology does not require complete wholes…..it is a theory that presents complete whole explanations, but this is why it is always in error. It presumes what is nowhere in existence, and then pretends to be omniscient…when it has never fully integrated chaos into its theories.

Even the cocnept o a universe is based on the projection of the mind in some external position, outside spacetime and then conceptualizing existence as a singular whole…which does not exist.

There can never be a compete whole ontology because existence is never complete nor whole, but dynamic and ongoing…..it is becoming never being.

Chaos, for one, prevents omniscience, as does the fact that existence is not a static thing, but a dynamic interactive process, where even organic will participates in its becoming.

Absolute knowledge and understanding is impossible…and those that claim it are liars and cowards, or charlatans trying to exploit human weaknesses.

Show me an absolute whole…an immutable,indivisible thing….or go away.

A diamond is not a whole is it? It isn't static, indivisible nor immutable…it is not a singularity…..

It remains dynamic, interactive, in flux…changing as you hold it, in ways you cannot perceive.

If you peer into its atomic stricture it disappears into a energy fields of effects… it is the organic brain that reduces existence to the forms it calls colours, tastes, forms, images etc.

This does not make them illusions….but representations…like a photo of a tree is not the tree…both tree and photo are both in existence, yes, but the photo is a representation of a phenomenon….and abstraction.

Now go off and talk with someone on your level…plenty of them here.

You tire me.

Believe in whatever nonsense makes you feel good.

What does it matter…as long as you behave in predictable ways, I have no issues.

4 Replies

---

daniel j lavender — 6d

> Silenus:
>
> All exists…

Precisely. And that's the commonality. Existence. Being. All *is* existence.

You concede with that statement. I could stop right there.

> Silenus:
>
> **even the representation of the energy pattern** is itself an energy pattern

Then why refer to it as a representation? Because representations exist, because emergent qualities and features exist beyond just energy.

All is existence, not energy. Energy is a forced, narrow term as illustrated here.

> Silenus:
>
>> daniel_j_lavender:
>>
>> What you're saying is incomprehensible because you lack a coherent, structured ontology.
>
> That's YOUR opinion because you lack IQ.
>
> You need a thing…this is what you call Ontolgy

Where is your ontology?

Where is your essay?

Where are your terms and definitions?

> Silenus:
>
> There can never be a compete whole ontology because existence is never complete nor whole, but dynamic and ongoing…..it is becoming never being.

You mean a complete foundational ontology? Yes, there can be, and this ontology seeks to accomplish that.

The ontology presented integrates any possible notion or phenomenon, whether scientific or theological. Any new discovery qualifies as existence, by definition. The ontology proactively integrates any and all concepts.

> Silenus:
>
> Show me an absolute whole…an immutable,indivisible thing….or go away.

The whole is not just a thing. The whole is all things and the connectedness of them.

> Silenus:
>
> existence is never complete nor whole, but dynamic and ongoing…..it is becoming never being.

Existence always is. Existence is all. It doesn't need to become. Parts become. The caterpillar becomes a butterfly, the student becomes a teacher, etcetera. Existence persists through change, existence is all of those things.

That you claim existence always is becoming, or always progressing, is due to your limited perspective in this particular timeframe as a conscious being.

Existence does not need to become. Existence is.

> Silenus:
>
> Now go off and talk with someone on your level…plenty of them here.
>
> You tire me.

Yes, I can imagine you are exhausted. You are finished.

3 Replies